

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,574,979 to West ("West"). Claims 1-10, 14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over West. Claims 31-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over West in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,229,432 to Fridley et al ("Fridley"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,697,787 to Matouka ("Matouka"). Claims 13, 15-17 and 36-37 were deemed to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claims 19-30 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

The Examiner is thanked for indicating allowable subject matter.

In this Amendment, claim 18 has been amended for clarity. Claims 11 and 31 have been amended to clarify the invention. Claims 14-15, and 36 have been amended to correct matters of form. Claim 35 has been cancelled. For the reasons stated below, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims pending in this application will be in condition for allowance, upon entry of this Amendment.

Applicants respectfully traverse the withdrawal of claims 19-30 as being directed to a non-elected invention. The Examiner indicates that claims 19-30 that were deemed withdrawn from consideration belong to class 370/350, while the remaining claims that were deemed constructively elected belong to class 370/347. However, Applicants respectfully point out that both classes belong to the sub-class 370/345. Applicants submit that any search for prior art

directed to the constructively elected claims 1-18, and 31-38 under sub-class 370/347, should, for completeness, entail search under sub-class 370/345 that includes sub-class 370/350 of claims 19-30. Accordingly, under §803.01(B) of the MPEP, since a serious burden is not presented, restriction of claims should not be required.

Claim 18 has been amended to clarify that the time period between successive segment B radiation bursts can alternate between 7 and 9 mS.

A distinguishing feature of the present invention, as recited in independent claim 1, is a method for transmitting information over a time duplexed link in the presence of interference bursts. The method entails arranging redundant transmission of the information over two different time slots of the duplexed link, such that the time between the slots is greater than the duration of the interference burst: "assigning a second time slot of the time communications duplexed link upon which a redundant copy of the information is to be transmitted, wherein the second time slot is spaced in time from the first assigned time slot by a duration greater than a typical duration of an interference burst; and transmitting the redundant copy of the information within the second time slot of the time communications duplexed link."

Although West is directed toward avoiding interference from a periodic interference, West does not disclose transmitting a redundant copy of the data packet on the second time slot. The Office Action asserted that the disclosure in column 22, lines 30-33 of West would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to modify West to arrive at the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that such modification would not have been obvious at the time the present invention was made because the context of the West disclosure discourages use for

redundant transmission in two way services such as voice communications, a form of time communications duplexed link. To support this argument, Applicants respectfully call the Examiner's attention to West column 22, lines 27-33, which is reproduced below for convenience:

“Two way services such as voice communications are the most sensitive to transport delay because delay impacts the interaction of the communicating parties. One way services are good candidates for interleaving or other forms of redundant transmission.”

Thus, in context, while West suggests that redundant transmission may be performed for one way services, West does not make similar suggestion with respect to two way services such as voice communications. Indeed, a plausible suggestion from West is that two way services would be poor candidates for redundant transmission. As such, West would discourage, and not motivate, one of ordinary skill in the art to modify West to arrive at the claimed invention of the present application, which recites transmission of redundant information in a time communications duplexed link.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertion by the Examiner that the alleged result of reducing transport delay can be a motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify West. In arranging redundant transmission of data over two different data slots, “transport delay,” as taught by West, is increased, not decreased. Transport delay occurs when speech is quantized and transmitted as a burst (West, column 22, line 18-20). In the present invention, as disclosed in page 13, final paragraph, when redundant transmission of a data packet occurs over the two different data slots, information from both data packets is buffered before playback on a receiving end. Accordingly, the time between when speech is first quantized into

a data packet for transmission, and when the best of two redundant copies of the quantized speech is played, that is, the transport delay, is greater than if redundant copies of the same data packet are not sent. Thus, the goal of reduced transport delay would not motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to modify West to arrive at the present invention, which can increase, not decrease, transport delay.

Independent claim 11 has been amended to recite a method of information transmission over a duplex link in the presence of interference, in which an enhanced mode entails communication over redundant and primary time slots: "wherein active physical links between the base unit and a portable handset are assigned redundant time slots in addition to primary timeslots used for communication between the base unit and handset." Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, claim 11 should also be patentable over West.

Similarly, claim 31 has been amended to recite "a system for transmitting information over a time duplexed communications link that is subject to periodic radiation bursts" where the enhanced mode entails "assigning a second time slot of the time duplexed communications link upon which a redundant copy of the information is to be transmitted . . . and transmitting the redundant copy of the information within the second time slot of the time duplexed communications link." For at least the reasons cited above with respect to claims 1 and 11, Applicants submit that amended claim 31 is patentable over West. Fridley teaches a transceiver having a zero crossing detector, while Matouka teaches a zero crossing detector coupled to a synchronized cycloconverter. However, West, Fridley, and Matouka, whether taken singly, or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a system for communicating over a duplex link subject to

interference, wherein an enhanced mode comprises transmitting a first copy of a data packet over a first slot of the duplex link, and a second copy over a second slot of the duplex link.

Accordingly, upon entry of the present Amendment, claim 31 should be in allowable condition.

At least for their dependence on allowable claims, all the remaining dependent claims are believed to be in allowable condition.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703-770-7696


Date: March 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

DION HORVAT, ET AL.

By:



 Pdt CHA
44.615
Michael D. Bednarek
Registration No. 32,329

MDB/PCC/RAR:kmh

Customer No. 28970